Presented 18/11/37

App. F. IX-4

"Preserved"

1936. (S & A)

S & A File No. 398-36

Serial Nos. 1–3

Previous References

S & A 5/C/12 S 13.10.04

S & A 62-18 C/12 S 13.10.04

S & A 51-12 CR 9 Nov

S & A 255-1/C/-29

Letter References.

"Preserved"

S & A 398-36 C/1 etc.

S.P. 4-36 C/1 etc.

S.P. 4-41 NC 1, 2, 3.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. three

Part B for March 1937

SUBJECT.

Disposal of the Vacant pensions of Putta Narayana Rozai of the Arakal Palleyara family

SR 2 To the Comptroller to Govt no. 76 5280 dated 4/8.2.1937

WD 0418—GPB—22,500—29-8-36

Direct that the extra pension be continued in the name of the Valiya chirayal on certain conditions

Disposal of the Vacant pension of Puttaswamy Royar of the Anekal [illegible] family

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. 398 of 1936. | [App. F. III-

Serial No.

J

Letter no 4064/S.H.T.-G 15-12-36 from the Comptroller to Govt forwarding the report of the S.H.T. Officer in regard to the disposal of the vacant pension of the late Puttaswamy Royar a Subbarayadar in the Anekal taluq [illegible]

1) In G.O. no 1176/S.A 42-6-8 of 1842 the Vacant pension of Rs 222-6-10 of Atthrajammanni of the Anekal Pallegar family, was registered in the name of the eldest heir Veerachikroyar with the condition that he should divide the pension equally between himself and his two brothers Ranjaroyar and Puttaswamy Royar. Puttaswamy royar one of the brothers is reported to have since died and the widow of the deceased has claimed her husband's share. The headbayadar has contested the claim of the widow and his contention is that according to G.O. of the pension has to be divided equally between himself on the one part and the other two brothers on the other, that is to say that according to the said G.O. he is entitled to take Rs 111-3-5 being one half of the pension out of Rs 222-6-10 and divide the remaining half between his other two brothers and that what is being paid to his deceased brother should revert to him

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 0417—GPB—30,000—8-9-36

after his death as his wife and children are well provided for otherwise. This Contention is based on the Strength of the words "between himself and his two brothers" used in the said G.O. And the Head Serawanaar interprets it as meaning that he should Constitute himself one of the other his two brothers. But the intention of Government was otherwise and the State Treasury officers while commencing on the meaning of the words in the said G.O. rightly said in his report that this is an "ingenious and frivolous Contention" of the Head Serawanaar.

It is submitted that the Head Serawanaar has equally shares the pension with his two brothers since the G.O. of August 1914. According to the Statement of the Agent the amount of Rs 222-6-0 is being shared equally by the three brothers and even Veera chitamparar does not deny this fact, but only he says that he was giving an equal share to each of the other two brothers out of Compassion and affection.

Govt by using the words "that he should divide the pension equally between himself and his two brothers" in the G.O.

Serial No.

of August 1919 did not intend that Veerachika-
-royar is entitled to retain half the pension
for himself and divide the balance ~~two~~
between the two brothers. Kind reference is
invited in this connection to paras 30-35
of the notes in the file S&A 42-18-10 containing
the opinion of the then Chief Secretary Mr Balasundaram Ayer
He was of the opinion that no special consideration
need be shown to Veerachikrayar and that
the pension be divided equally between the
three brothers. This is supported by the
first member vide para 46 of the notes in
the same file. I therefore agree with the
chief secretary that Veerachikarayar is no longer
entitled to any special consideration to the exclusion
of his brothers, and that the pension should be
divided equally among the surviving sons of
the deceased Chikkarayar (the original addressee)

4) According to G.O. no R 6925-6/667 of
5-2-1889, the pension of Akkajammanni
should descend to her adopted son whom
it is proposed to marry her daughter's daughter.
There appears to be no doubt, the fact that
Veerachikarayar has to marry the pension daughter
of Akkajammanni should have weighed

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 0417—GPB—30,000—3-9-36

with the Govt in passing the order of 5th Feb 1889.
But the marriage was an unhappy one
as Thirayammanni was ill treated by her
husband and remained separately, and also
died leaving no issues of her own.
This reference is noted in para 20 in
A K Rajammanni's petition of 1912. There the Govt
states that Veera chikkrayar can't have no
interest + Claim to his pension and that
whatever right he can't assert to it must
be through his wife Thirayammanni.
3) The 1st member held a Contrary
a different view. viz that it was the intention
of Govt the order of 1889 to make Veerachikarayar
the + inheritor of the pension from
Thirayammanni, and the fact that he
ill treated his wife and that she was remaining
separately from him cannot in any
way affect his right, and that the Trustees
of Veerachikarayar are only entitled
to maintenance. But this was not
accepted. This reference is noted in
para 6. in the Secretariat note to
H.H. the Maharaja -
1) From the note above it may perhaps

Sta Feb Stt 57-12 (9470) Flag C.

Flag L.

Disposal of the vacant pension of Puttaswamy Nayaka of the Anekal Palegar family -

General and Revenue Secretariat — File No. 398 of 1936. — [App. F. III—2

Serial No.

be inferred that Veerachikka royar stands on an equal footing with his brothers and that the share of the Head barawardar is only 1/3 and no more - Veerachikka royar has not behaved in a manner becoming of a Head barawardar (vide paras 12 & 13 of the P. W. D. of the State Mysore Treasury Officer's report.

7) The recommendation of the State Mysore Treasury Officer to divide the pension into three equal parts among 1. Veerachikkaroyar. 2. Nanjaraya 3. Basavamanni (minors of Puttaswamy Nayaka) is for ~~three~~ and make it payable separately to each of the ~~three~~ brothers is for ever - In other words the recommendation is that the pension ceased vacant by the death of Puttaswamynayaka stands descend to his minor Basavamanni as the guardian of her two minor Daughters - [It is not stated whether the two minor daughters are unmarried]

7/11

8) The pension ~~of~~ Rs 222-6-10 now being drawn by the Head - barawardar Mr Veerachikka Royar - of Anekal family - may be divided Equally among the three

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 0417—GPB—30,000—8-9-36

Disposal of the vacant pension of Sm Puttaswamy royal of the Anekal pallegar family

SA File No. 398 of 1936. | General and Revenue Secretariat

Serial No.

claimants — the two surviving brothers viz Mr. Veerachikkarayar & Nanjarayar & the widow Basammani (wife of deceased Puttasami Rayar). as recommended by the S. H. T. Officer in para 16 of his report. This will set at rest any possible complaints from the widow or the other brother particularly after the misconduct of the Head Barawardar in obtaining the thumb impression of the deceased brother when he lay unconscious — vide affidavit given before the Amildar. Flag B

(H Secy) WW 11/1 A

Petition dt 13-1-37 from Veerachikkroyal, Head Barawardar of the pension requesting to be heard in the matter.

H Secy's remarks in the Petition

"He wants his case to be argued in the matter by a lawyer"

(Submitted with reference to Secy's orders in the margin.) Sub dt 8.5. 13-1-37

"It is not necessary to hear him through a lawyer — The pension though vested in the name of the Head Barawardar was being enjoyed by the three brothers equally as per Court orders. His contention that he should get 1/2 and the other two brothers the other half is not tenable and this was not the practice till now — as reported by the S-H-T Officer — As recommended by the latter the share

Disposal of the Vacant pension of the late mr Puttaswamy nayar of the Anekal palegar family

General and Revenue Secretariat

Govt File No. 398 of 1936. 2300 [App. F. III—2

Serial No.

of the deceased brother may be given to his wife - but it is not necessary to order the Separate registry of the 3 shares now. This measure may be adopted later if the three families complain of all not being at present ~~one~~ and not ~~the~~ disturb the registry in the Head Bonawaddars name

29/12

Dewan)

29/1/37

15) MD
29-1-37

16) A draft G.O. is put up for approval 30/1

also an endorsement from Veerachikroyal

1/2 1/2

17) H Secy) 4/2

5/2

18) Issue 5/2

G.O. no H 250 98. 2.37

Comptroller to Govt

Directs that the entire pension be continued in the name of mr Veerachikroyal but that he should distribute it equally among (1) himself - (2) Nanjarayan & (3) brothers sons Basavannaik

6. FEB. 1937 GENL. SECTION

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 0417—GPB—30,000—8-9-36

S.A. 398-36-1

FINANCIAL BRANCH 2024 18 DEC. 1936 GEN. & R.

In reply please quote reference to No. S.H.T. 4064.

OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER TO THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,

Bangalore, dated 15th December *1936*.

FINANCIAL SECRETARY 7 DEC. No.

FROM

A. N. RAGHAVACHAR, ESQ., M.A.,
Comptroller to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Bangalore.

To

Rajaseva Nipuna
S. Shamanna Esq., B.A.,
Financial Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
Bangalore.

SIR,

I have the honour to forward herewith for the orders of Government the report of the State Huzur Treasury Officer, Bangalore together with the connected papers in regard to the pension of Rs.74-2-3 which the late Mr.Puttaswamy Royar a sub baravardar of Anekal family was receiving from the head baravardar Viz., Mr.Veerachikka Royar.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Comptroller.

U.

No.3904/S.H.Try. Office of the State Huzur Treasury,

Bangalore, Dated: 14th December 36.

From

G. Rudrappa, Esq., M.A., Bar-at-Law.,

Officer in Charge,

State Huzur Treasury, Bangalore.

To

A.N. Raghavachar, Esq., M.A.,

Comptroller to the Government

of Mysore, Bangalore.

Sir,

I have the honour to report that one of the three pensioners, viz., Puttaswamy Rayar of the Anekal Pollegar family died on 23-9-1936. The fact of his death was also reported to me in person by Mr. Veerechikka Rayar the eldest of the brothers on the 7th October 1936. This is also supported by the death certificate granted by the Anekal Municipality which is produced and is in the records.

2. Both the remaining brothers appeared before me on 9-10-1936, and wanted the payment of their monthly pension according to Government order No.1176 S&A. No.42-18 dated 14-8-1919. The entire amount, viz., Rs.222-6-10 is being paid to Mr. Veerechikka Rayar, the eldest of the brothers in whose name the pension is registered. This amount is being divided equally among the three brothers and according to the direction contained in the above Government order, Mr. Veerechikkarayar has to receive the entire amount, take his own portion and pay the two other portions to each of his brothers. He has been doing this since 1919 the date of the said G.O.

3. The widow of the deceased Puttaswamy Rayar has presented a petition to this office asking me to permit her to take her husband's share independently and separately through her agent. Nanje rayar also wants his share to

to be paid separately, vide his application dated 6-11-36. Vide Flag A. This seems to require the sanction of Government.

4. Manje Rayar has also stated in writing before us that he has no objection to the payment of the share of pension of his deceased brother, to his widow, viz., Vide flag B. Kasam Ammal. Mr. Veerachikkarayar merely said that for the time being his pension and that of Manjarayar might be paid as usual and what is payable to his deceased brother might be kept in deposit pending his representation.

5. As his prayer for drawing only 2/3 rds of the pension and keeping the remaining 1/3 in deposit could not be granted, he was asked to submit his statement as early as possible and he did so on 9-11-1936. His statement is marked flag C and the reply of Manje rayar to the statement was also filed in this office on 2-12-1936 and it is marked flag D. Veerachikke Rayar's contention is that according to Government order No.Fl.1176 S & A 42-19 dated 14-8-1919 his pension had to be divided equally between himself on the one part and the other two brothers on the other, that is to say, that according to the said order he was entitled to Rs.111-3-5 one half of the pension, out of Rs.222-6-10 and divide the remaining half equally among the other two brothers and that what was being paid to his deceased brother should revert to him after his death as his wife and children are well provided for otherwise.

6. This contention he bases on the strength of the word used in between which the said G.O. and he argues that one party constitutes himself, the other party his two brothers. No doubt the word as used gives support to this contention, but the intention of Government and the practice hitherto has been quite to the contrary. If the word "among" had been used the petitioner would have had no ground to raise this ingenious and favorable contention, now, after having equally shared the pension with his two brothers since the

the said Government order. According to the statement of their agent himself the amount, viz., Rs.222-6-10 is being shared equally by the three brothers, vide flag E, and even Veerechikkarayar does not deny this fact; only he now says that he was giving an equal share to each of the other two brothers out of compassion and affection for them.

7 It is unnecessary for me to mention that this contention is most frivolous and untenable although the pension is registered in the name of the eldest viz., Veerechikkarayar, the Government have recognised in their order No.1176 & A 42-18-8 dated 14-8-1919 the claims of all the three brothers to an equal share.

8. And as the deceased has left his wife and two minor daughters behind him, his share of the pension must go to his wife Basammanni and her two minor daughters for their maintenance. After the death of Basammanni and the marriage of her two daughters this share will no doubt revert to the male heirs but even then it will have to be divided between Veerechikke Rayar and Nanjarayar and their lawful heirs.

9. Another consideration that Veerechikkarayar urges for rejecting the prayer of Basammanni is that he is in pecuniary difficulties and that he has a pocket Rs. 30/- and that he [illegible] from daughters of his deceased second brother Sankararayar. But from the records and the statement of Nanjarayar filed before me, it is clear that each of the three brothers was given Rs. 10/- per month and not Veerachikkarayar alone (vide 28-8-19), vide flag F.

10. Veerechikkarayar also refers to a document dated [illegible] by the other two brothers agreeing [illegible] each out of th[illegible]

family pension. The document is dated 15-2-1916. Why this was not enforced after the Government order was passed is not explained by the head Baravanddar and it is futile to produce this inoperative document now for supporting his contension. It will thus be seen that all the contensions raised by Veerechikkarayar are ~~prevelus~~ frivolous ~~xxxxxxx~~ and untenable.

11. In this connection it is my duty to bring to the notice of Government a petition dated 5-9-1936 sent to this office by the late Puttaswamy rayar a few days before his death and the statement given before me by Nanjarayar as they throw some light on the conduct and character of Veerechikkarayar, vide flags G & H.

12. It would appear that on the 2nd of September 1936 when the deceased was laying unconcious, in a critical state, Veerachikkarayar who was in Bangalore was sent for by the wife of the deceased and that he (Veerechikkarayar) arrived the next day at Anekal, with his two sons-in-law viz., Mr. M.C.Veereppa (Advocate) and Puttaswamy, with a prepared adoption deed for the purpose of giving one of his sons in adoption to the deceased brother and the three together went to the sick room and took the thumb impression of the deceased to that document when he was unconscious and kept the document with them and that the circumstance was observed by Nanjarayar and ~~xxxx~~ and also by the deceased by seeing the ink-mark on his thumb, on the following day.

13. As a petition similar to the one given to me was also given to the local Magistrate (as per flag E) it would appear that this suspecious document has not been produced probably for the reason that it could not be proved. The unexpected death of the deceased and continuing to live ~~xxxxxxx~~ frustrated the object [illegible] only [illegible] executed [illegible]

his friends. If the party had died as soon as the thumb impression was taken, I have no doubt that this document would have been produced and presented before me to defeat the claim of the widow to her husband's share of the family pension.

14. From the foregoing, it will be seen that the registered baravardars has not tried to deal fairly with the sub-baravardars and their interests and that on the contrary he has shown reprehensible tendency to advance his own selfish interests. He has thus shown himself to be unfit to be a trustee for the other two, for receiving their money and distributing it among them. His conduct too according to the statement of his own brothers (both living and deceased) which there is no reason to doubt does not seem to be very honorable and becoming a head baravardar. The head-baravardar from his contentions still seems to be labouring under the impression that he has the sole right as the eldest of the brothers to receive the entire amount and enjoy it, and that he should be given the liberty of giving any thing he chooses to the other brothers out of compassion. With the intention he is asking the Government to reject the claim of the widow and permit him to appropriate for himself the share of her deceased husband. It seems to me that this opportunity should be availed of to make it clear to him that his share is only one third and no more.

15. I therefore recommend that the pension may be divided into three equal parts and made payable separately to each of the huckdars.

16. The connected papers are herewith enclosed for reference and return.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

G. Rudrappa

Officer in Charge,
State Huzur Treasury.

S.S. 80

G. R. S. App. F VI—G 2]

SUBJECT ..... 2 Drafts .....

.....

.....

Diary. No of letter replied to .....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 193 .

Date of issue 8/2/37 193 .

Signed by Mr K. Venkata Rao.

May this be—

(i) printed ?

(ii) treated as a standing order ?

(iii) published in the Gazette, English Part ?

(iv) translated ?

(v) placed at the disposal of the press ?

(vi) published in the Gazette, Kannada Part ?

Section

File No.

Serial No.

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Read— 1. G.O. No 1176/SAA 42-18-8 dt 14.8.1936 ordering that the vacant pension of Rs 222-6-0 of A K Kajamanni of the Anekal Pattegar family be registered in the name of the eldest heir Mr Veerachi Rayar with the direction that he should divide the pension equally between himself and ~~order thereon~~ No. his two brothers Nanjaraya and Puttaswamy rayar

2. Letter No S.H.T. 4064 dt 15.12.36 from the Comptroller to Govt forwarding the report of the Asst S.H. Officer on the disposal of the portion of pension (Rs 74-2-3) of the late Mr Puttaswamy rayar one of the brothers who is

[illegible] died on 23-9-36 and
recommending that in the circumstances
stated the entire pension of Rs 222 6-0
now registered in the name of Mr Veerachikrayar
be divided into 3 equal parts and
registered separately in the names of
the heirs viz (1) Mr Veerachikrayar
(2) Mr Ramayyar (3) Basammanni minor
of the late Puttaswamy rayar

Order No. 52507 8/2/37

The pension of Rs 222-6-0
originally stood in the name of Akkajammanni
of the Anekal Kallegar family. On her
demise, the vacant pension
was registered in the name of Mr Veerachikrayar
with the direction that he should divide
the pension equally between himself and
his two brothers Ramayrayar and Puttaswamyrayar.
Puttaswamyrayar one of the brothers is
reported to have since died and the report of the S.H.F. Officer
declares that
Headaravanaboor Mr Veerachikrayar
has contended that he should get the
one half of the pension and the other

List of Enclosure

Copied by

Examined by

G. R. S. App. F. G. 3.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation sheet draft form.*)

~~both~~ two brothers the other half-
The Head Basavandar has shared the
pension equally with his two brothers
from the year 1919 and his as admitted by him
contention raised for the first time now
~~therefore~~ is not tenable ~~as there was no~~
~~the practice till now~~ Govt. direct that
the share of the deceased brother viz Puttu-
Sami Nayar be continued to his widow Basavanmmani
2. At the same time the State Thyagam
Treasury Officer recommends after proper enquiry that the
pension of Rs 222-6-00 now registered in
the name of mr Veerachikrayar be
divided into 3 equal parts and drawn
payable separately to each of the brothers
Govt do not consider it necessary to
order the separate registry of the
three shares as recommended by him
~~He~~ accordingly direct that the
entire pension be continued in the
name of mr Veerachikrayar as hitherto
but with ~~the~~ direction that the Shares
distributed it equally among (1) himself
(2) his brother Ranjanayar & (3) Sister-
in-law as Basavanmmani for the benefit
of herself and her two unmarried sisters

WD 0255—GPB—10,000—23-8-32

Extract

PROCEEDINGS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

Read:-

Government Order No.1176/S & A.42-18-8 dated 14th August 1919 ordering that the vacant pension of Rs.222-6-10 of Akkajammanni of the Anekal Pallegar family be registered in the name of the eldest heir Mr.Veerachikrayar with the direction that he should divide the pension equally between himself and his two brothers Nanjeroyar and Puttaswamy royar.

2. Letter No.S.H.T.4064 dated 15th December 1936 from the Comptroller to Government, forwarding the report of the State Huzur Treasury Officer on the disposal of the portion of pension (Rs.74-2-3) of the late Mr.Puttaswamy royar one of the brothers, who is reported to have died on 23rd September 1936 and recommending that in the circumstances stated the entire pension of Rs.222-6-10 now registered in the name of Mr.Veerchikkaroyar be divided into 3 equal parts and registered separately in the names of the huckdars viz (1) Mr.Veerachikkaroyar (2) Mr.Nanjroyar (3) Basammanni widow of the late Puttaswamy royar.

Order No. Fl 5-250/S+A 398-36-2

Dated, Bangalore, the 6th February 1937.

The pension of Rs.222-6-10 in question originally stood in the name of Akkajammanni of the Anekal Pallegar family. On her demise, the vacant pension was registered in the name of Mr.Veerachikkaroyar with the direction that he should divide the pension equally between himself and his two brothers Nanjaroyar and Puttaswamyroyar. Puttaswamyroyar, one of the brothers, is reported to have since died and the report of the State Huzur Treasury Officer discloses that the Head barawardar Mr.Veerachikkaroyar has contended that he should get the one half of the pension and the other two brothers the other half. The Head barawardar has shared the pension equally with his two brothers from the year 1919 as admitted by him and his contention raised for the first time now is not tenable. Government direct that the share of the deceased brother viz, Puttaswamiroyar be continued to his widow Basavammanni.

2. At the same time, the State Huzur Treasury Officer recommends after proper enquiry that the pension of Rs.222-6-10 now registered in the name of Mr.Veerachikkaroyar be divided into 3 equal parts and made payable separately to each of the huckdars. Government do not consider it necessary to order the separate registry of the three shares as recommended by him and accordingly direct that the entire pension be

p.t.o.

be continued in the name of Mr.Veerachikkaroyar as hitherto, but that he should distribute it equally among (1) himself (2) his brother Nanjaroyar and (3) sister-in-law Basammanni for the benefit of herself and her two unmarried daughters.

The State Huzur Treasury Officer should see that the sum of Rs.74-2-3 being the share of Basammanni is disbursed to her regularly every month with effect from the date of death of her husband viz 23rd September 1936.

K.Venkata Rao
for Financial Secretary to Government.

To

The Comptroller to the Government of Mysore, with records.

mk.2

2 Drafts

Appendix F G—1]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section 8.44

File No. 398-36

Serial No. 3

No.

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

To

The Veerachikkarayer of the
Anekal palegar family
Anekal

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193* .

With reference to his ~~Memorial~~ petition
dt 13.1.37 praying for a hearing in the
matter of the disposal of the vacant pension
of his late brother Puttaswamy Rayar,
~~The Manager~~ the Veerachikkarayer is informed that Govt
consider that there is no need for
~~hearing him thro' a lawyer.~~
~~Any argument of the case by a lawyer~~
~~as the facts pertaining to it are~~
~~to be Considered therein.~~

Date of issue.....

Signed by .....

List of enclosures.....

Copied by .....

2 His Contention that he should
get the one half of the pension and his
other two brothers the other half is not
tenable.

3) The intention of the Govt all along
is that he should share the pension
equally with his two brothers Nanjarayan
and Puttaswamy rayar

Examined by .....

Separate orders have been issued directing the distribution of the pension not being drawn by him as head-baraawardar equally among himself (1) his brother Nanjarayar (2) his brother Puttaswamy Rayar (3) Basavamma, widow of his deceased brother

WD 03601—GPB—30,000—23.9.35

DR B.O.

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS
THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

General and Revenue Secretariat

430

Requisition for papers

Section S & R.

A

B

Filed

Deposit No.

File No. 332-38

Serial No. all

To be put up Diary No. 1040 of 19 41-42

Signature H N Chamberlain.

Branch

Section

Date 3/9/41

WD 03702—GTB—750 books of 100 pp. each—16-10-39

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat

Bangalore, Dated, 6th February 1937

~~D.O.No.~~ H. 5251/SRA. 398-36-3

ENDORSEMENT.

To

Mr.Veerachikroyar of the Anekal
pallegar family, ANEKAL.

With reference to his petition dated 13th January 1937 praying for a hearing in the matter of the disposal of the vacant pension of his late brother Puttaswamyroyar, Mr.Veerachikkaroyar is informed that Government consider that there is no need for hearing him through a lawyer.

2. His contention that he should get the one half of the pension and the other two brothers the other half is not tenable.

3. Separate orders have been issued directing the distribution of the pension now being drawn by him as head-barawarder equally among (1) himself (2) his brother Nanjaroyar and (3) Basammanni, widow of his deceased brother Puttaswamy Royar.

By order,

K Venkata Rao

For Financial Secretary to Govt.

mk.